

<b>DATA ITEM DESCRIPTION</b>		FORM APPROVAL OMB NO 0704-0188	
1. TITLE Analysis of Institutional Controls		2. IDENTIFICATION NUMBER OE-100	
3. DESCRIPTION / PURPOSE To provide the requirements for Institutional Controls Analyses which are prepared as part of the Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis Reports for Ordnance and Explosives (OE) projects.			
4. APPROVAL DATE (YYMMDD) 000303	5. OFFICE OF PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY CEHNC-OE-CX	6a. DTIC APPLICABLE	6b. GIDEP APPLICABLE
7. APPLICATION / INTERRELATIONSHIP			
8. APPROVAL LIMITATION	9a. APPLICABLE FORMS	9b. AMSC NUMBER	
10. PREPARATION INSTRUCTIONS  10.1 The contractor shall prepare an institutional analysis to support the development of institutional control plans of action. Institutional controls rely on existing powers and authorities of other government agencies to protect the public at large from OE risks. Instead of direct elimination of the OE from the site, these plans rely on behavior modification and access control strategies to reduce or eliminate OE risk. An objective of the institutional analysis is to identify government agencies having jurisdiction over OE contaminated lands and to assess their appropriateness, capability, and willingness to assert this control. Institutional Control Alternatives selected for evaluation shall be based on their apparent ability to satisfy project objectives. Potentially effective Institutional Controls shall be developed and evaluated as a part of the Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA).  10.2. Institutional Summaries. For each institution selected for review, the following information shall be provided by the contractor:  10.2.1. Name of Agency 10.2.2 Origin of Institution 10.2.3 Basis of Authority 10.2.4 Sunset Provisions 10.2.5 Geographic Jurisdiction 10.2.6 Public Safety Function 10.2.7 Land Use Control Function 10.2.8 Financial Capability (in general terms only; not detailed accounting)  10.3 Institutional Control Alternatives Selection. The recommendation for detailed analysis shall document and consider the following factors:  10.3.1 Purpose of Study 10.3.2 Methodology 10.3.3 Scope of Effort/Selection Criteria (If not totally comprehensive, how were evaluated agencies selected?) 10.3.4 Technical Capability 10.3.5 Intergovernmental Relationships (Ability to partner with other agencies) 10.3.6 Stability 10.3.7 Funding Sources Recommended for Detailed Analysis			
11. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT			

10.4 Institutional Control Alternatives Analysis. Institutional Control alternatives for detailed analysis may consist of single or combined strategies, as appropriate. These alternatives must be completely formulated. All management, execution, and support roles shall be identified. All costs to participating institutions shall be estimated by the contractor. Candidate strategies may involve concepts similar to the following:

Access Control Alternatives

Direct intervention like fencing and other barriers combined with trespass law enforcement

Land use restrictions (zoning laws and enforcement)

Regulatory control (permit application, review, and approval of development plans)

Passive measures such as dedication of property to appropriate land uses

Behavior Modification Alternatives

Notification of real estate defect

Notices attached to building and/or construction permits

Training clinics, education to children, etc.

10.5 Residual Risk. Each alternative that makes final cut (screening) shall be assessed for its role in reducing residual risk (that from OE/UXO not eliminated by physical removal alternatives or left due to incompatibility of physical removal with community needs). Bizarre behavior should be specifically excluded. Normal behavior of reasonable persons is the model for analysis. Thoughtful prose is sufficient. Statistical, numerical and phenomological expressions should be excluded.